

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4–16, and 29–31 are pending as previously presented. Claims 2, 3, and 17–28 are cancelled.

The claims of this application are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bilgrami in view of Struengmann. Mathowitz is also cited against the claims of this application.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and submits that the combination of Bilgrami and Struengmann (with or without Mathowitz) does not provide all of the features of the present invention as claimed. In particular, the cited combination does not provide a tablet comprising *inter alia* a dried extract that consists essentially of ingredients of an aqueous extract of red vine leaves and up to about 10% by weight of colloidal, anhydrous silica.

Claim 1 recites a tablet comprising up to 50% by weight of at least one excipient; and at least 50% by weight of a dried extract, the dried extract consisting essentially of ingredients of an aqueous extract of red vine leaves and up to about 10% by weight of colloidal, anhydrous silica.

In other words, the present invention as claimed recites colloidal, anhydrous silica as a component of the dried extract *per se* rather than merely within or surrounding the tablet. The dried extract (including the silica) is a separate ingredient in the tablet apart from the excipient (as well as from the optional film).

Unlike the present claim 1, the combination of cited references does not provide or even suggest a dried extract consisting of colloidal, anhydrous silica. As indicated by the Examiner, Bilgrami does not provide or even suggest a dried extract comprising silica. Struengmann discloses silica as a conventional tablet additive, but, like Bilgrami, also does not provide or even suggest a dried extract comprising silica. Mathowitz discloses “the conventional practice of [adding] controlled-release coatings (films) in tablet manufacture, which, again, like Bilgrami and Struengmann, does not provide or even suggest a dried extract comprising silica.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests that the §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 4–16, and 29–31 as being obviated by Bilgrami in light of Struengmann (and Mathowitz) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

/THOMAS BLANKINSHIP/

Thomas Blankinship
Reg. No. 39,909